



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,077	10/21/2003	William R. Jones	600323-059	6126
73019 7590 09/07/2010				
IBM Corp. (AUS)				
c/o Ostrow Kaufman & Frank LLP				
The Chrysler Building				
405 Lexington Avenue, 62nd Floor				
New York, NY 10174				
EXAMINER				
TRAN, QUOC DUC				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/07/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sformicola@okflp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/689,077

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc D. Tran

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Terminal Disclaimer

1. The terminal disclaimer filed on 9/2/2004 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,335 has been reviewed and is NOT accepted.

An attorney or agent, not of record, is not authorized to sign a terminal disclaimer in the capacity as an attorney or agent acting in a representative capacity as provided by 37 CFR 1.34 (a). See 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins et al (5,850,426) in view of Harper et al (5,416,833) and further in view of Glaser et al (5,875,242).

Consider claim 1, Watkins et al teach an apparatus (Fig. 1: centralize system 116) for integrating a plurality of maintenance and testing systems that communicate with a plurality of disparate systems (Fig. 1: reporting systems 104-114), comprising: a platform that supports a control interface (col. 3 line 66 – col. 4 line 12) and a different user interface for each of the plurality of disparate systems (col. 4 lines 21-55 and Fig. 8), said platform enabling the

communicating of data to each of said plurality of disparate systems (col. 2 lines 29-35; col. 4 lines 21-27).

Watkins et al did not clearly disclosed of disparate telecommunications systems (i.e., WFA, OSS, NMA, REACT 2001) and enabling the formatting and transfer of appropriate data to each of said plurality of disparate telecommunication systems from the control interface as asserted by applicant. Harper et al teach an administration system having a graphical user interface system (SSNS) for the switched telephone network that communicate with a Ready-To-Serve RTS processor that interacts with a plurality of telecommunications systems (i.e., WFA, MARCH, CSOP, LFACS, etc.) and wherein the SSNS interface with the variety of systems and platforms in a window format (i.e., formatting and transfer of appropriate data) to assist negotiation of service and inquiries (see Fig. 6; col. 7 lines 53-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Harper et al into view of Watkins et al in order to reduce operating cost by eliminating work flow or service orders through multiple systems.

Furthermore, Watkins and Harper et al did not clearly suggest the control interface allows the user to login and perform testing, trouble-shooting or billing updates. However, Glaser et al suggested such (see abstract; col. 8 lines 48-61; col. 18 lines 4-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Glaser et al into view of Watkins and Harper et al for providing a single point of control and for reduce the amount of entry.

Consider claim 2, Watkins et al teaches said control interface enabling a user to selectively access each of the different user interfaces (col. 5 lines 1-65).

Consider claim 3, Watkins et al teach where said disparate systems comprising a testing system that performs at least one of remote testing of analog services and testing of ISDN switches (col. 15-25; col. 8 lines 31-39).

Consider claim 4, Glaser et al teach the claimed limitation (see col. 18 lines 4-8).

Consider claim 5, Watkins et al teach wherein said platform enabling a user to select at least one of a printer setup routine, an employee activity input routine, a timesheet routine, a control interface parameter selection routine, an alarm routine, a default email setting routine, an exit routine, an activity information backup routine, a work and force administration/control routine that enables the user to further select one of a plurality of activities, a security routine, a windows cascade routine, a help routine, a windows select routine that enables the user to further select one of a plurality of available windows, a save placement routine that enables the user to save a configuration of the platform, a platform information routine, a ticket maintenance routine, a specify ticket routine that enables a user to select a ticket, a specify circuit routine that enables a user to specify a circuit, a trouble report processing routine, a work and force administration and control routine that enables the user to select an information screen associated with a ticket, and a close application routine (col. 7 lines 15-25).

Consider claim 6, Watkins et al teach said platform enabling a user to select one of the different user interfaces and at least one of review and update information associated with a customer authorization request (col. 5 line 58 – col. 6 line 14).

Consider claim 7, Watkins et al teach said different user interfaces each enabling a user to at least one of retrieve and update information associated with one of the plurality of disparate systems (col. 5 line 58 – col. 6 line 14).

Consider claim 8, Watkins et al teach an apparatus (Fig. 1: centralize system 116) for integrating a plurality of maintenance and testing systems that communicate with a plurality of disparate systems (Fig. 1: reporting systems 104-114; col. 7 lines 6-31), comprising: a platform that supports a control interface (col. 3 line 66 – col. 4 line 12) and a different user interface for each of the plurality of disparate systems (col. 4 lines 21-55 and Fig. 8-9), said platform permitting parallel asynchronous testing of at least two of said disparate systems that are connected to the platform (col. 7 lines 41-56; col. 8 lines 22-39).

Watkins et al did not clearly disclosed of disparate telecommunications systems (i.e., WFA, OSS, NMA, REACT 2001) and enabling the formatting and transfer of appropriate data to each of said plurality of disparate telecommunication systems from the control interface as asserted by applicant. Harper et al teach an administration system having a graphical user interface system (SSNS) for the switched telephone network that communicate with a Ready-To-Serve RTS processor that interacts with a plurality of telecommunications systems (i.e., WFA, MARCH, CSOP, LFACS, etc.) and wherein the SSNS interface with the variety of systems and platforms in a window format (i.e., formatting and transfer of appropriate data) to assist negotiation of service and inquiries (see Fig. 6; col. 7 lines 53-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Harper et al into view of Watkins et al in order to reduce operating cost by eliminating work flow or service orders through multiple systems.

Furthermore, Watkins and Harper et al did not clearly suggest the control interface allows the user to login and perform testing, trouble-shooting or billing updates. However, Glaser et al suggested such (see abstract; col. 8 lines 48-61; col. 18 lines 4-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Glaser et al into view of Watkins and Harper et al for providing a single point of control and for reduce the amount of entry.

Consider claim 9, Watkins et al teach where said platform performing at least one of remote testing of analog services and testing of ISDN switches in accordance with vendor-specific criteria (col. 15-25; col. 8 lines 31-39).

Consider claim 10, Watkins et al teach where each of said different user interfaces comprising a graphical user interface (GUI) that facilitates at least one of retrieving data and entering data (Fig. 8-9).

Consider claim 11, Watkins et al teach where said platform sending and receiving data between said platform and said disparate telecommunications systems (col. 7 lines 57-67).

Consider claim 12, Watkins et al teach where said control interface enabling a user to access each of the different user interfaces (col. 5 lines 1-65).

Consider claim 13, Watkins et al teach where said different user interfaces each enabling a user to at least one of retrieve and update information associated with one of the plurality of disparate telecommunications systems (col. 5 line 58 – col. 6 line 14).

Consider claim 14, Watkins et al teach a computer readable medium for storing a program (Fig. 1: centralize system 116; col. 3 lines 60-65) that integrates a plurality of maintenance and testing systems that communicate with a plurality of disparate systems (Fig. 1: reporting systems 104-114; col. 7 lines 6-31), comprising: a plurality of different user interfaces each communicating with one of the plurality of disparate systems, said plurality of different user interfaces interoperating with the plurality of disparate systems (col. 4 lines 21-55 and Fig.

8-9); and a control interface (col. 3 line 66 – col. 4 line 12), said control interface enabling the communicating of data from to each of said plurality of disparate systems (col. 2 lines 29-35; col. 4 lines 21-27), said control interface enabling a user to access each of the different user interfaces (col. 5 lines 1-65).

Watkins et al did not clearly disclosed of disparate telecommunications systems (i.e., WFA, OSS, NMA, REACT 2001) and enabling the formatting and transfer of appropriate data to each of said plurality of disparate telecommunication systems from the control interface as asserted by applicant. Harper et al teach an administration system having a graphical user interface system (SSNS) for the switched telephone network that communicate with a Ready-To-Serve RTS processor that interacts with a plurality of telecommunications systems (i.e., WFA, MARCH, CSOP, LFACS, etc.) and wherein the SSNS interface with the variety of systems and platforms in a window format (i.e., formatting and transfer of appropriate data) to assist negotiation of service and inquiries (see Fig. 6; col. 7 lines 53-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Harper et al into view of Watkins et al in order to reduce operating cost by eliminating work flow or service orders through multiple systems.

Furthermore, Watkins and Harper et al did not clearly suggest the control interface allows the user to login and perform testing, trouble-shooting or billing updates. However, Glaser et al suggested such (see abstract; col. 8 lines 48-61; col. 18 lines 4-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Glaser et al into view of Watkins and Harper et al for providing a single point of control and for reduce the amount of entry.

Consider claim 15, Watkins et al teach where said disparate systems including a testing system that performs at least one of remote testing of analog services and testing of ISDN switches (col. 15-25; col. 8 lines 31-39).

Consider claim 16, Glaser et al teach the claimed limitation (see col. 18 lines 4-8).

Consider claim 17, Watkins et al teach wherein said control interface enabling a user to select at least one of a printer setup routine, an employee activity input routine, a timesheet routine, a common user interface parameter selection routine, an alarm routine, a default email setting routine, an exit routine, an activity information backup routine, a work and force administration/control routine that enables the user to further select one of a plurality of activities, a security routine, a windows cascade routine, a help routine, a windows select routine that enables the user to further select one of a plurality of available windows, a save placement routine that enables the user to save a configuration of the platform, a platform information routine, a ticket maintenance routine, a specify ticket routine that enables a user to select a ticket, a specify circuit routine that enables a user to specify a circuit, a trouble report processing routine, a work and force administration and control routine that enables the user to select an information screen associated with a ticket, and a close application routine (col. 7 lines 15-25).

Consider claim 18, Watkins et al teach where said control interface enabling a user to select one of the different user interfaces and at least one of review and update information associated with a customer authorization request (col. 5 line 58 – col. 6 line 14).

Consider claim 19, Watkins et al teach where said different user interfaces each enabling a user to at least one of retrieve and update information associated with one of the plurality of disparate systems (col. 5 line 58 – col. 6 line 14).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
6. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop ____ (explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Quoc Tran** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7511**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Curtis Kuntz**, can be reached on **(571) 272-7499**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Technology Center 2600** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2600**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).